

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ADIL HIRAMANNEK, et al.,
Plaintiffs,

v.

L. MICHAEL CLARK, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 5:13-cv-00228-RMW

**ORDER ON OBJECTION TO
MAGISTRATE'S ORDER (DKT. NO.
240) AND NON-CONSENSUAL
REFERRAL**

Re: Dkt. No. 254

Plaintiff Roda Hirananeek objects to the magistrate judge's "Order Denying Ex Parte Application Objecting to Referral to a Magistrate Judge" (Dkt. No. 240). In the objection presently before the court, Plaintiff renews¹ her objection that she did not consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction. As the magistrate judge's order explained, consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction is not required when the case has been referred to a magistrate judge for discovery purposes. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72.

The magistrate judge's order is **AFFIRMED**.

Dated: September 4, 2015



Ronald M. Whyte
United States District Judge

¹ *See* Dkt. No. 238.